arXiv:1606.06934v1 [math.PR] 22 Jun 2016

The Annals of Applied Probability
2016, Vol. 26, No. 3, 1581–1619
DOI: 10.1214/15-AAP1126
© Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2016

ESTIMATION FOR STOCHASTIC DAMPING HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS UNDER PARTIAL OBSERVATION. III. DIFFUSION TERM

By Patrick Cattiaux*, José R. León†,1,2 and Clémentine Prieur‡,1

*Université de Toulouse**, *Universidad Central de Venezuela*† *and Université Grenoble Alpes*‡

This paper is the third part of our study started with Cattiaux, León and Prieur [*Stochastic Process. Appl.* **124** (2014) 1236–1260; *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **11** (2014) 359–384]. For some ergodic Hamiltonian systems, we obtained a central limit theorem for a nonparametric estimator of the invariant density [*Stochastic Process. Appl.* **124** (2014) 1236–1260] and of the drift term [*ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **11** (2014) 359–384], under partial observation (only the positions are observed). Here, we obtain similarly a central limit theorem for a nonparametric estimator of the diffusion term.

1. Introduction. In this article, we consider the estimation, using data sampled at high frequency, of the local variance or diffusion term $\sigma(\cdot,\cdot)$ in the system $(Z_t := (X_t, Y_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, t \geq 0)$ governed by the following Itô stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = Y_t\,dt, \\ dY_t = \sigma(X_t, Y_t)\,dW_t - (c(X_t, Y_t)Y_t + \nabla V(X_t))\,dt. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

The function c is called the damping force and V the potential, σ is the diffusion term and W a standard Brownian motion.

Received July 2014; revised May 2015.
[1]Supported in part by the project ECOS NORD/FONACIT (France-Venezuela) V12M01 *Equations différentielles stochastiques et analyse de sensibilité : applications environnementales*.
[2]Supported in part by the Inria International Chairs program.
AMS 2000 subject classifications. Primary 62M05; secondary 60H10, 60F05, 35H10.
Key words and phrases. Hypoelliptic diffusion, variance estimation, fluctuation-dissipation models.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article published by the Institute of Mathematical Statistics in *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 2016, Vol. 26, No. 3, 1581–1619. This reprint differs from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

The problem of estimating the diffusion term, sometimes called volatility, in a model of diffusion has a somewhat long history and has a lot of motivations, in particular in the analysis of financial or neuronal data.

The beginning of the story takes place at the end of the eighties of the last century. The first and seminal articles were written by [11, 12, 15] and [17]. The method generally used is the central limit theorem for martingales. Recently, an excellent survey introducing the subject and giving some important recent references was written by [26]. In that work, the authors give some insights about the methods of proof of the limit theorems and recall also the existence of some goodness of fit tests useful in financial studies. This article also mentioned the names of those linked to the development in this area. They are, among others, [3, 21] and [2]. The second of the last cited works contains a deep study for the asymptotic behavior of discrete approximations of stochastic integrals; it is thus in tight relationship with the estimation of the diffusion term.

The present article is the continuation of two previous works by the authors: [7] and [8]. In the first one, we tackled the problem of estimating the invariant density of the system (1.1) and in the second one the estimation of the drift term $(x,y) \mapsto b(x,y) = -c(x,y)y + \nabla V(x)$ was studied. In both papers, we assumed that the diffusion coefficient σ is constant, in order to control the mixing rate of the process (see the remarks at the end of the present paper for extensions to the nonconstant diffusion case).

Here, we consider the estimation of the function σ, in particular we do no more assume necessarily that it is a constant. We observe the process in a high resolution grid, that is, $Z_{ph_n}, p = 1, \dots, n$ with $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$. As for our previous works, we consider the case where only the position coordinates X_{ph_n} are observed (partial observations). This is of course the main technical difficulty. This situation leads us to define the estimator using the second-order increments of process $\Delta_2 X(p,n) = X_{(p+1)h_n} - 2X_{ph_n} + X_{(p-1)h_n}$. This fact introduces some technicalities in the proof of each result.

In the first part of the article, we consider the case of infill statistics $t = nh_n$ is fixed. Two situations are in view: first, σ is a constant and we estimate σ^2 by using a normalization of $\Delta_2 X(p,n)$, second, σ is no more constant and we estimate $\int_0^t \sigma^2(X_s, Y_s)\, ds$. In both cases, we obtain a stable limit theorem with rate $\sqrt{n}$ for the estimators (for the definition of stable convergence in law see the next section).

This asymptotic convergence can be applied, for instance, for testing the null hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0$: the matrix σ contains only nonvanishing diagonal terms that is, $\sigma_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$.

In the second part, we study the infinite horizon estimation $nh_n = t \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} +\infty$. We assume that the rate of mixing of the process $(Z_t, t \geq 0)$ is sufficiently high. Whenever σ is a constant, we obtain a central limit theorem (CLT)

for the estimator of σ^2 with rate $\sqrt{n}$. However, in the case where σ is not a constant we get a new CLT but the rate now is $\sqrt{nh_n}$ and the asymptotic variance is the same as the one obtained for occupation time functionals.

The result in the infinite horizon can serve to test $\mathcal{H}_0 : \sigma(x,y) = \sigma$ against the sequence of alternatives $\mathcal{H}_1^n : \sigma_n = \sigma + c_n d(x,y)$, for some sequence c_n tending to zero as n tends to infinity, because of the difference in the convergence rate under the null and under the sequence of alternatives.

Estimation with partial observations has been considered previously in the literature. In [18], the case of one-dimensional diffusion V_t is studied. One observes only $S_t = \int_0^t V_s\,ds$, in a discrete uniform grid. The estimation is made for the parameters defining the variance and the drift. More recently for the same type of models, the problem of estimation was considered in [9]. In this last work, the study is nonparametric in nature; it deals with adaptive estimation, evaluating the quadratic risk. The models in both these articles, contrary to models of type (1.1), do not allow the second equation to depend on the first coordinate. It can be written as

$$\begin{cases} dS_t = V_t\,dt, \\ dV_t = \sigma(V_t)\,dW_t + b(V_t)\,dt. \end{cases}$$

The literature concerning the estimation for models of type (1.1) is rather scarce. However, two papers must be cited. First, [27] consider parameter estimation by using approximate likelihoods. The horizon of estimation is infinite and they assume $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ and $nh_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} +\infty$. Second, [28] introduce, in the case of partial observations, an Euler contrast defined using the second coordinate only. We should point out that the present work, while dealing with nonparametric estimation, has a nonempty intersection with the one of [28] when the diffusion term is constant.

In Section 5, we consider Langevin dynamics described by

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = Y_t\,dt, \\ dY_t = \sqrt{2\beta^{-1}}s(X_t)\,dW_t - (s(X_t)s^*(X_t)Y_t + \nabla V(X_t))\,dt. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

This form of hypo-elliptic diffusion is a particular case of (1.1) with $\sigma(x,y) \times \sigma^*(x,y) = \frac{2}{\beta}c(x,y)$. This last relation is called fluctuation-dissipation relation since it relates the magnitude of the dissipative term $-c(X_t,Y_t)\,dt = -s(X_t)s^*(X_t)Y_t\,dt$ and the magnitude of the random term $\sigma(X_t,Y_t)\,dW_t = \sqrt{2\beta^{-1}}s(X_t)\,dW_t$. The precise balance between the drift term which removes energy in average and the stochastic term provided by the fluctuation-dissipation relation insures that the canonical measure is preserved by the dynamics. More precisely, under assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ of Section 2, it is proved that the solution of (1.2) is ergodic with invariant probability measure proportional to the Boltzmann distribution $\exp(-\beta H(x,y))$, where $H(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}|y|^2 + V(x)$ and β is inversely proportional to the temperature (see, e.g., [23, 25]).

Numerical experiments are provided in Section 6.

Let us end this Introduction with some comments about some possible generalizations. In the first place, the methods that we use in this work can be adapted for considering the power variation type estimators defined as

$$V_F(n) = \sum_{p=0}^{(([t/(2h_n)]-1)h_n} F(\Delta_2 X(p,n)),$$

for F a smooth function, usually $F(x) = |x|^r$ the rth power variation (see, e.g., [20]). Second, it would be possible to study an estimator constructed through a Fourier transform method as the one defined in [24].

2. Tools.

2.1. *Stable convergence.* In this article, the type of convergence we consider is the stable convergence, introduced by Renyi, whose definition is recalled below (see Definition 2.1). In this subsection, all random variables or processes are defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

DEFINITION 2.1 (Definition 2.1 in [26]). Let Y_n be a sequence of random variables with values in a Polish space $(E, \mathcal{E})$. We say that Y_n converges stably with limit Y, written $Y_n \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{S}} Y$, where Y is defined on an extension $(\Omega', \mathbb{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ iff for any bounded, continuous function g and any bounded $\mathbb{F}$-measurable random variable Z it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}(g(Y_n)Z) \to \mathbb{E}'(g(Y)Z)$$

as $n \to +\infty$, where $\mathbb{E}$ (resp., $\mathbb{E}'$) denotes the expectation with respect to probability $\mathbb{P}$ (resp., $\mathbb{P}'$).

If $\mathbb{F}$ is the σ-algebra generated by some random variable (or process) X, then it is enough to consider $Z = h(X)$ for some continuous and bounded h. It is thus clear that the stable convergence in this situation is equivalent to the convergence in distribution of the sequence (Y_n, X) to (Y, X). It is also clear that convergence in probability implies stable convergence. As shown in [26], the converse holds true if Y is $\mathbb{F}$ measurable.

Notice that we may replace the assumption Z is bounded by $Z \in \mathbb{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$. This remark allows us to replace $\mathbb{P}$ by any $\mathbb{Q}$ which is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, that is, the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Assume that Y_n [defined on $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$] converges stably to Y. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be a probability measure on Ω such that $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} = H$. Then Y_n [defined on $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{Q})$] converges stably to the same Y [defined on $(\Omega', \mathbb{F}', \mathbb{Q}' = H\mathbb{P}')$].*

In particular, in the framework of our diffusion processes, this proposition combined with Girsanov transform theory will allow us to "kill" the drift.

2.2. *About the s.d.e. (1.1).* In all of the paper, we will assume (at least) that the coefficients in (1.1) satisfy:

- $\mathcal{H}_0$ The diffusion matrix σ is symmetric, smooth, bounded as well as its first and second partial derivatives and uniformly elliptic, that is, $\forall x, y$, $\sigma(x,y) \geq \sigma_0 \mathrm{Id}$ (in the sense of quadratic forms) for a positive constant $\sigma_0 > 0$.
- $\mathcal{H}_1$ The potential V is lower bounded and continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- $\mathcal{H}_2$ The damping matrix c is continuously differentiable and for all $N > 0$: $\sup_{|x|\leq N, y\in\mathbb{R}^d} |c(x,y)| < +\infty$ and $\exists c_0, L > 0$ $c^s(x,y) \geq c_0 \mathrm{Id}$ for all $|x| > L, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, c^s being the symmetrization of the matrix c.

Under these assumptions, equation (1.1) admits an unique strong solution which is nonexplosive. In addition, we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.3 (Lemma 1.1 in [30]). *Assume $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$. Then, for every initial state $z = (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, the s.d.e. (1.1) admits a unique strong solution $\mathbb{P}_z$ (a probability measure on Ω), which is nonexplosive. Moreover, $\mathbb{P}_z \ll \mathbb{P}_z^0$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t)$ for each $t > 0$, where $\mathbb{P}_z^0$ is the law of the solution of (1.1) associated to $c(x,y) = 0$ and $V = 0$, and with $(\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(Z_s, 0 \leq s \leq t))_{t\geq 0}$.*

REMARK 2.4. The formulation of $\mathcal{H}_0$ can be surprising. Let σ^* denote the transposed matrix of σ. Actually the law of the process depends on $\sigma\sigma^*$ (which is the second-order term of the infinitesimal generator). If this symmetric matrix is smooth, it is well known that one can find a smooth symmetric square root of it, which is the choice we make for σ. As it will be clear in the sequel, our estimators are related to $\sigma\sigma^*$ (hence here σ^2).

3. Finite horizon (infill) estimation. We consider infill estimation, that is we observe the process on a finite time interval $[0,T]$, with a discretization step equal to h_n with $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$.

According to Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 2.2, *any $\mathbb{P}_z^0$ stably converging sequence Y_n is also $\mathbb{P}_z$ stably converging to the same limit.* Hence, *in all of this section we will assume that $\mathcal{H}_0$ is satisfied and that c and V are identically* 0. Any result obtained in this situation is thus true as soon as $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are satisfied.

3.1. *The case of a constant diffusion matrix.* We start with the definition of the "double" increment of the process.

Define for $1 \le p \le [\frac{T}{2h_n}] - 1 := p_n$ (here $[\cdot]$ denotes the integer part)

$$\Delta_2 X(p,n) = X_{(2p+1)h_n} - 2X_{2ph_n} + X_{(2p-1)h_n}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^{-1}\Delta_2 X(p,n) &= \int_{2ph_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} W_s\,ds - \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{2ph_n} W_u\,du \\ &= \int_{2ph_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (W_s - W_{2ph_n})\,ds + \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{2ph_n} (W_{2ph_n} - W_u)\,du.\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side is the sum of two independent centered normal random vectors, whose coordinates are independent, so that $\sqrt{\frac{3}{2h_n^3}}\sigma^{-1}\Delta_2 X(p,n)$ is a centered Gaussian random vector with covariance matrix equal to Identity (recall that we assume that $\sigma = \sigma^*$).

Furthermore, all the $(\Delta_2 X(p,n))_{1\le p\le p_n}$ are independent (thanks to our choice of the increments).

So we define our estimator $\hat\sigma_n^2$ of the matrix σ^2 as

$$\hat\sigma_n^2 = \frac{1}{[T/(2h_n)]-1}\frac{3}{2h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{[T/(2h_n)]-1} \Delta_2 X(p,n)\otimes\Delta_2 X(p,n), \tag{3.2}$$

where $A\otimes B$ denotes the (d,d) matrix obtained by taking the matrix product of the $(d,1)$ vector A with the transposed of the $(d,1)$ vector B, denoted by B^*.

Using what precedes, we see that

$$\sigma^{-1}\hat\sigma_n^2\sigma^{-1} = \frac{1}{[T/(2h_n)]-1}\sum_{p=1}^{[T/(2h_n)]-1} M(p,n),$$

where for each n the $M(p,n)$ are i.i.d. symmetric random matrices whose entries $M_{i,j}$ are all independent for $i \ge j$, satisfying $\mathbb{E}_z^0(M_{i,j}) = \delta_{i,j}$ and $\mathrm{Var}_z^0(M_{i,j}) = 1 + \delta_{i,j}$.

According to the law of large numbers and the central limit theorem for triangular arrays of independent variables, we have the following.

LEMMA 3.1 (Convergence). *Assume $c = 0$, $V = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, starting from any initial point $z = (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we have*

$$\hat\sigma_n^2 \underset{n\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathbb{P}_z^0}{\longrightarrow}} \sigma^2,$$

and

$$\left(\left[\frac{T}{2h_n}\right]-1\right)^{1/2}(\sigma^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_n^2\sigma^{-1}-\mathrm{Id})\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{N}_{(d,d)},$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{(d,d)}$ *is a* (d,d) *symmetric random matrix whose entries are centered Gaussian random variables with* $\mathrm{Var}(\mathcal{N}_{i,j})=1+\delta_{i,j}$*, all the entries* (i,j) *for* $i\geq j$ *being independent.*

The consistence result is interesting since convergence in $\mathbb{P}_z^0$ probability implies convergence in $\mathbb{P}_z$ probability (i.e., for general c and V). The convergence in distribution however is not sufficient and has to be reinforced into a stable convergence.

This is the aim of what follows.

To this end, we define the sequence of processes defined for $0\leq t\leq T$,

$$\hat{\sigma}_n^2(t)=\frac{1}{[T/(2h_n)]-1}\frac{3}{2h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\Delta_2X(p,n)\otimes\Delta_2X(p,n), \tag{3.3}$$

where the empty sums are set equal to zero. We will prove the following.

THEOREM 3.2 (Convergence in Skorohod's metric). *Assume* $c=0$*,* $V=0$ *and* $\mathcal{H}_0$*.*

Then if $h_n\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{}0$*, starting from any initial point* $z=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$*, we have*

$$\left(W_\cdot,\sqrt{\frac{T}{2h_n}}(\sigma^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_n^2(\cdot)\sigma^{-1}-\mathrm{Id})\right)\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{D}([0,T])\times\mathcal{D}([0,T])}(W_\cdot,\tilde{W}_\cdot),$$

where $(\tilde{W}_t,t\in[0,T])$ *is a* (d,d) *symmetric matrix valued random process whose entries are Wiener processes with variance* $\mathrm{Var}_{i,j}(t)=(1+\delta_{i,j})(t/T)$*, all the entries* (i,j) *for* $i\geq j$ *being independent. In addition* $\tilde{W}_\cdot$ *is independent of* $W_\cdot$*.*

According to the discussion on stable convergence, we immediately deduce the following.

COROLLARY 3.3 (Stable convergence). *Under assumptions* $\mathcal{H}_0$*,* $\mathcal{H}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{H}_2$*, if* $h_n\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{}0$*, starting from any initial point* $z=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$*, we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{2h_n}}(\sigma^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_n^2\sigma^{-1}-\mathrm{Id})\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{S}}\mathcal{N}_{(d,d)},$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{(d,d)}$ *is as in Lemma 3.1.*

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2. In the following, we fix $T=1$ without loss of generality. Notice that we may also replace $\frac{T}{2h_n}$ by $[\frac{T}{2h_n}]-1$ (using Slutsky's theorem if one wants).

The convergence of

$$t \mapsto Z_n(t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2h_n}}\sigma^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_n^2(t)\sigma^{-1}$$

to a matrix of Wiener processes is proved as for Donsker invariance principle. The only difference here is that instead of an i.i.d. sample we look at a triangular array of i.i.d. random vectors (on each row), but the proof in [4] applies in this situation. This result is sometimes called Donsker–Prohorov invariance principle. Writing W_t as the sum of its increments on the grid given by the intervals $[(2p-1)h_n,(2p+1)h_n]$ the convergence of the joint law of $(W_\cdot, Z_n(\cdot))$ in $\mathcal{D}([0,1])$ is proved in exactly the same way.

The final independence assumption is a simple covariance calculation. □

3.2. *Estimation of the noise, general case.* In this section, we do not assume anymore that the diffusion term σ is constant.

In the following, we want to estimate $\int_0^t \sigma^2(X_s,Y_s)\,ds$, for any $0\le t\le T$.

To this end, we introduce the quadratic variation process defined for $n\in\mathbb{N}^*$ and $0\le t\le T$ as

$$\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t) = \frac{1}{h_n^2}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \Delta_2 X(p,n)\otimes\Delta_2 X(p,n), \tag{3.4}$$

with $\Delta_2 X(p,n)$ defined in (3.1). The main result of this section is the following.

THEOREM 3.4. *Under assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$, if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, starting from any initial point $z=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we have for any $0\le t\le T$*

$$\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathbb{P}_z}{\longrightarrow}} \frac{1}{3}\int_0^t \sigma^2(X_s,Y_s)\,ds,$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{h_n}}\left(\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t) - \frac{1}{3}\int_0^t \sigma^2(X_s,Y_s)\,ds\right) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathcal{S}}{\longrightarrow}} \frac{2}{3}\int_0^t \sigma(X_s,Y_s)\,d\tilde{W}_s\sigma(X_s,Y_s),$$

where $(\tilde{W}_t, t\in[0,T])$ is a symmetric matrix valued random process independent of the initial Wiener process $W_\cdot$, whose entries $\tilde{W}_\cdot(i,j)$ are Wiener processes with variance $V_{i,j}(t)=(1+\delta_{i,j})t$, these entries being all independent for $i\ge j$.

Recall that for the proof of this theorem, we only need to consider the case where $c=0$ and $V=0$.

In this case, the strong solution, with initial conditions $(X_0,Y_0)=(x,y)=z$, can be written as

$$Z_t=(X_t,Y_t)=\left(x+yt+\int_0^t Y_s\,ds, y+\int_0^t \sigma(X_s,Y_s)\,dW_s\right).$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_2 X(p,n)=&\int_{2ph_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}\left[\int_0^s \sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,dW_u\right]ds\\&-\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{2ph_n}\left[\int_0^s \sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,dW_u\right]ds.\end{aligned}$$

Using Fubini's theorem for stochastic integrals, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_2 X(p,n)=&\,h_n\int_0^{2ph_n}\sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,dW_u\\&+\int_{2ph_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}((2p+1)h_n-u)\sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,dW_u\\&-h_n\int_0^{(2p-1)h_n}\sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,dW_u\\&-\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{2ph_n}(2ph_n-u)\sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,dW_u,\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\Delta_2 X(p,n)=\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,dW_u. \tag{3.5}$$

If $p\neq q$ are two integers, denoting by $\Delta_2 X(p,n,i)$ the ith coordinate of $\Delta_2 X(p,n)$, we immediately have, for all $i,j=1,\dots,d$,

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0(\Delta_2 X(p,n,i)\Delta_2 X(q,n,j))=0. \tag{3.6}$$

As a warm up lap, we look at the convergence of the first moment of $\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}$.

LEMMA 3.5 (Preliminary result). *Assume $c=0$, $V=0$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then, if $h_n\underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow}0$, starting from any initial point $z=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we have for any $0\le t\le T$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t)\underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow}\frac{1}{3}\int_0^t\mathbb{E}_z^0\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\,du.$$

Recall that we assumed $\sigma = \sigma^*$, and of course look at the previous equality as an equality between real matrices.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.5. First, using Itô's isometry and equality (3.5), one gets

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0(\Delta_2 X(p,h_n)\otimes\Delta_2 X(p,h_n)) = \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u-2ph_n|)^2 \mathbb{E}_z^0\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\,du.$$

Since

$$\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u-2ph_n|)^2\,du = \frac{2}{3}h_n^3,$$

we thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{h_n^2}\mathbb{E}_z^0(\Delta_2 X(p,h_n)\otimes\Delta_2 X(p,h_n)) - \frac{1}{3}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} \mathbb{E}_z^0\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\,du \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{h_n^2}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u-2ph_n|)^2 \\
&\qquad \times \mathbb{E}_z^0(\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u) - \sigma^2(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n}))\,du \\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{3}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} \mathbb{E}_z^0(\sigma^2(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n}) - \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u))\,du.
\end{aligned}$$

Define on $\Omega\times[0,t]$, the sequence of random (matrices)

$$G_n(u) = \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \sigma^2(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n})\mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}.$$

Since σ is continuous, G_n converges $\mathbb{P}_z^0\otimes du$ almost everywhere to $\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)$. In addition, since σ is bounded, G_n is dominated by a constant which is $\mathbb{P}_z^0\otimes du$ integrable on $\Omega\times[0,t]$.

Hence, using Lebesgue bounded convergence theorem, we get that

$$\int_0^t \mathbb{E}_z^0(G_n(u) - \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u))\,du \to 0.$$

Similarly, the variables

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \frac{(h_n - |u-2ph_n|)^2}{h_n^2} \\
&\qquad \times \mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}(\sigma^2(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n}) - \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u))
\end{aligned}$$

are bounded and converge almost everywhere to 0, so that their expectation also goes to 0. This completes the proof. □

Of course, a careful look at this proof shows that we did not use all the strength of $\mathcal{H}_0$, only the fact that σ is continuous and bounded. It is thus clearly possible to improve upon this result, using the same idea of introducing the skeleton Markov chain and controlling the errors.

Hence, introduce

$$\Delta_2 H(p,h_n) = \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u-2ph_n|)\sigma(X_{(2p-1)h_n}, Y_{(2p-1)h_n})\, dW_u. \tag{3.7}$$

We may decompose

$$J_n^1 + J_n^2 + J_n^3 = \mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t) - \frac{1}{3}\int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\, du \tag{3.8}$$

with

$$J_n^1 = \mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t) - \frac{1}{h_n^2}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \Delta_2 H(p,h_n)\otimes\Delta_2 H(p,h_n),$$

$$J_n^2 = \left(\frac{1}{h_n^2}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \Delta_2 H(p,h_n)\otimes\Delta_2 H(p,h_n)\right) - \frac{1}{3}\left(\int_0^t G_n(u)\, du\right),$$

$$J_n^3 = \frac{1}{3}\left(\int_0^t G_n(u)\, du - \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\, du\right).$$

For $A=(A_{i,j})_{1\le i\le q,1\le j\le r}$ a $q\times r$ real matrix, we define $|A|$ as $|A| = \max_{1\le i\le q,1\le j\le r}|A_{i,j}|$.

We then have the following.

LEMMA 3.6. *Assume $c=0$, $V=0$, $(X_0,Y_0)=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then there exist constants C depending on σ, its derivatives and the dimension only, such that for any $0\le t\le T$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0\left(\left|\int_0^t G_n(u)\, du - \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\, du\right|\right) \le Ct\sqrt{h_n}, \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0(|\Delta_2 X(p,h_n) - \Delta_2 H(p,h_n)|^2) \le Ch_n^4. \tag{3.10}$$

PROOF. For the first part, it is enough to show that

$$\int_0^t \mathbb{E}_z^0|G_n(u) - \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)|\, du \le Ct\sqrt{h_n}.$$

But using the fact that σ and its first derivatives are continuous and bounded, there exists a constant C only depending on these quantities (but which may change from line to line), such that

$$\int_0^t \mathbb{E}_z^0|G_n(u)-\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)|\,du \le Ct \sup_{|a-b|\le 2h_n} \mathbb{E}_z^0(|Z_a-Z_b|) \le Ct\sqrt{h_n}. \tag{3.11}$$

For the second part, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_z^0(|\Delta_2 X(p,h_n)-\Delta_2 H(p,h_n)|^2)\\ &\quad=\mathbb{E}_z^0\bigg(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)^2\\ &\qquad\times \mathrm{Trace}((\sigma(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n})-\sigma(X_u,Y_u))^2)\,du\bigg),\end{aligned}$$

from which the result easily follows as before. □

We deduce immediately the following.

PROPOSITION 3.7. *Assume $c=0$, $V=0$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then, if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, starting from any initial point $z=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we have for any $0\le t\le T$, that J_n^1 and J_n^3 are converging to 0 in $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathbb{P}_z^0)$ (with rates h_n and $\sqrt{h_n}$), hence in $\mathbb{P}_z^0$ probability.*

PROOF. The result for J_n^3 is contained in the previous lemma. For J_n^1, we calculate $\mathbb{E}_z^0[|J_n^1|]$. The (i,j)th term of J_n^1 is given by

$$\frac{1}{h_n^2}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}(\Delta_2 X(p,h_n,i)-\Delta_2 H(p,h_n,i))(\Delta_2 X(p,h_n,j)-\Delta_2 H(p,h_n,j)),$$

so that, according to the previous lemma and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we thus have $\mathbb{E}_z^0[|J_n^1|]\le Cth_n$. □

In order to prove the first part of Theorem 3.4, that is, the convergence in probability, it remains to look at J_n^2. We have

$$\begin{aligned}J_n^2=\frac{1}{h_n^2}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}&\sigma(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n})\bigg(M(p,h_n)-\frac{2h_n^3}{3}\mathrm{Id}\bigg)\\ &\times\sigma(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n}),\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$M(p,h_n)=\Delta_2 W(p,h_n)\otimes\Delta_2 W(p,h_n)$$

and

$$\Delta_2 W(p,h_n)=\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\,dW_u.$$

As before, we start with an estimation lemma.

LEMMA 3.8. *Assume $c=0$, $V=0$, $(X_0,Y_0)=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then there exist constants C depending on σ, its derivatives and the dimension only, such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0\left(\left|M(p,h_n)-\frac{2h_n^3}{3}\mathrm{Id}\right|^2\right)\le Ch_n^6. \tag{3.13}$$

PROOF. We shall look separately at the diagonal terms and the off diagonal terms of $M(p,h_n)-\frac{2h_n^3}{3}\mathrm{Id}$.

The off diagonal terms are of the form $A_{i,j}(n)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}A_{i,j}(n)=&\left(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\,dW_u^i\right)\\&\times\left(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\,dW_u^j\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where W^i and W^j are independent linear Brownian motions. Introduce the martingales

$$U_i(s)=\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{s}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\,dW_u^i$$

defined for $(2p-1)h_n\le s\le(2p+1)h_n$. Using Itô's formula, $A_{i,j}(n)$ can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(U_j(u)-U_j((2p-1)h_n))(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\,dW_u^i\right)\\&\quad+\left(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(U_i(u)-U_i((2p-1)h_n))(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\,dW_u^j\right)\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_z^0(A_{i,j}^2(n))\\&\quad=2\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)^2\mathbb{E}_z^0[(U_i(u)-U_i((2p-1)h_n))^2]\,du\\&\quad=2\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)^2\end{aligned}$$

$$\times \left(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{u} (h_n - |s - 2ph_n|)^2 \, ds \right) du$$
$$= Ch_n^6,$$

where C is some universal constant, so that we get the result.

The diagonal terms can be written $A_{i,i}(n)$ with

$$A_{i,i}(n) = \left(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|) \, dW_u^i \right)^2 - \frac{2}{3} h_n^3$$
$$= 2 \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (U_i(u) - U_i((2p-1)h_n))(h_n - |u - 2ph_n|) \, dW_u^i, \tag{3.15}$$

and we can conclude exactly as before. □

We can now state the following.

PROPOSITION 3.9. *Assume $c = 0$, $V = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then, if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, starting from any initial point $z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we have for any $0 \le t \le T$, that J_n^2 converges to 0 in $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_z^0)$ (with rate $\sqrt{h_n}$), hence in $\mathbb{P}_z^0$ probability.*

PROOF. We look at each term $(J_n^2)_{ij}$ of the matrix J_n^2. Such a term can be written in the form

$$(J_n^2)_{ij} = \frac{1}{h_n^2} \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \sum_{l,k=1}^{d} a_{l,k,i,j}(X_{(2p-1)h_n}, Y_{(2p-1)h_n}) A_{l,k}(p, n),$$

where the $a_{l,k,i,j}$'s are C_b^2 functions, and the $A_{l,k}(p, n)$ are defined in the proof of the previous lemma (here we make explicit the dependence in p). Hence,

$$h_n^4 (J_n^2)_{ij}^2$$
$$= \sum_{p,q=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \sum_{l,k,i,j=1}^{d} b_{l,k,i,j}(X_{(2p-1)h_n}, Y_{(2p-1)h_n})$$
$$\times c_{l,k,i,j}(X_{(2q-1)h_n}, Y_{(2q-1)h_n}) A_{l,k}(p, n) A_{i,j}(q, n)$$

for some new functions $b_{l,k,i,j}$ and $c_{l,k,i,j}$. As we remarked in (3.6), the expectation of terms where $p \neq q$ is equal to 0, so that

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0[h_n^4 (J_n^2)_{ij}^2] \le C \sum_{l,k,i,j=1}^{d} \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \mathbb{E}_z^0[A_{l,k}(p, n) A_{i,j}(p, n)]$$
$$\le Cth_n^5,$$

according to the previous lemma and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, hence the result. □

We thus have obtained the first part of the main theorem, that is, the following.

COROLLARY 3.10 (Consistence result). *Under assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$, if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, starting from any initial point $z=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we have for any $0\le t\le T$*

$$\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_z}} \frac{1}{3}\int_0^t \sigma^2(X_s,Y_s)\,ds.$$

We turn now to the second part of the main theorem, that is, the obtention of confidence intervals. Again we assume first that $c=0$ and $V=0$.

Since we will normalize by $\sqrt{h_n}$, we immediately see that the first "error" term $J_n^1/\sqrt{h_n}$ converges to 0 in $\mathbb{P}_z^0$ probability according to the rate of convergence we obtained in Proposition 3.7.

For the second error term J_n^3, the convergence rate in $\sqrt{h_n}$ is not sufficient to conclude. So, we have to improve on it.

LEMMA 3.11. *Assume $c=0$, $V=0$, $(X_0,Y_0)=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then there exists some constant C depending on σ, its first two derivatives and the dimension only, such that for any $0\le t\le T$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0\left(\left|\int_0^t G_n(u)\,du - \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\,du\right|\right) \le Cth_n, \tag{3.16}$$

hence $(\int_0^t G_n(u)\,du - \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u,Y_u)\,du)/\sqrt{h_n}$ goes to 0 in $\mathbb{P}_z^0$ probability.

PROOF. To begin with

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u) - G_n(u)\\ &\quad= \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} (\sigma^2(X_u,Y_u) - \sigma^2(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n}))\mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}.\end{aligned}$$

Now look at each coordinate, and to simplify denote by f the coefficient σ_{ij}^2. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}&f(Z_u) - G_n^{ij}(u)\\ &\quad= \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n} \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^u \Big(\langle\sigma(Z_s)\nabla_y f(Z_s), dW_s\rangle\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Trace}(\sigma D_y^2 f\sigma)(Z_s)\,ds+\langle Y_s,\nabla_x f(Z_s)\rangle\,ds\Big)$$

$$=\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}(I^1(n,p,u)+I^2(n,p,u)$$

$$+I^3(n,p,u)+I^4(n,p,u)),$$

with

$$I^1(n,p,u)=\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{u}\langle\sigma(Z_s)\nabla_y f(Z_s)-\sigma(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})\nabla_y f(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}),dW_s\rangle,$$

$$I^2(n,p,u)=\langle\sigma(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})\nabla_y f(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}),W_u-W_{(2p-1)h_n}\rangle,$$

$$I^3(n,p,u)=\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{u}\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Trace}(\sigma D_y^2 f\sigma)(Z_s)\,ds,$$

$$I^4(n,p,u)=\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{u}\langle Y_s,\nabla_x f(Z_s)\rangle\,ds.$$

Notice that $|I^3(n,p,u)|\le C(u-(2p-1)h_n)$ so that

$$\int_0^t\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}|I^3(n,p,u)|\,du\le Cth_n.$$

Similarly, $|I^4(n,p,u)|\le C(\sup_{0\le s\le t}|Y_s|)(u-(2p-1)h_n)$ so that

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0\left(\int_0^t\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}|I^4(n,p,u)|\,du\right)$$

$$\le Cth_n\mathbb{E}_z^0\Big(\sup_{0\le s\le t}|Y_s|\Big)\le Ct(1+t^{1/2})h_n$$

according to the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality.

Now

$$(\mathbb{E}_z^0(|I^1(n,p,u)|))^2$$

$$\le E_z^0(|I^1(n,p,u)|^2)$$

$$=E_z^0\left[\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{u}|\sigma(Z_s)\nabla_y f(Z_s)-\sigma(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})\nabla_y f(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}|^2\,ds\right]$$

$$\le C(u-(2p-1)h_n)\mathbb{E}_z^0\Big(\sup_{|a-b|\le 2h_n}|Z_a-Z_b|^2\Big)$$

$$\le Ch_n(u-(2p-1)h_n)$$

using the fact that σ and its first two derivatives are bounded and (3.11). It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0\left(\int_0^t \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}|I^1(n,p,u)|\,du\right)\le Cth_n.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\mathbb{E}_z^0\left|\int_0^t \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}I^2(n,p,u)\,du\right|\right)^2\\&\quad\le \mathbb{E}_z^0\left(\left|\int_0^t \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}I^2(n,p,u)\,du\right|^2\right)\\&\quad\le 2\mathbb{E}_z^0\left[\int_0^t\int_0^t \sum_{p,q=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}\right.\\&\qquad\left.\times\,\mathbb{1}_{(2q-1)h_n\le s<(2q+1)h_n}\mathbb{1}_{s\le u}I^2(n,p,u)I^2(n,q,s)\,ds\,du\right].\end{aligned}$$

As before, if $(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n$ and $(2q-1)h_n\le s<(2q+1)h_n$,

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0(I^2(n,p,u)I^2(n,q,s))=0$$

as soon as $p\neq q$.

If $p=q$,

$$|\mathbb{E}_z^0(I^2(n,p,u)I^2(n,p,s))|\le C\sqrt{u-(2p-1)h_n}\sqrt{s-(2p-1)h_n},$$

so that for a fixed u between $(2p-1)h_n$ and $(2p+1)h_n$, s belongs to $[(2p-1)h_n,u]$ and

$$\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^u |\mathbb{E}_z^0(I^2(n,p,u)I^2(n,p,s))|\,ds\le Ch_n^{3/2}(u-(2p-1)h_n)^{1/2}.$$

Integrating with respect to du, we finally get

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_z^0\left|\int_0^t \sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \mathbb{1}_{(2p-1)h_n\le u<(2p+1)h_n}I^2(n,p,u)\,du\right|\right)^2\le Cth_n^2,$$

as expected. □

We turn now to the central limit theorem for J_n^2 defined in (3.12). We will prove the following.

PROPOSITION 3.12. *Assume* $c(x,y)=0$, $V=0$ *and* $\mathcal{H}_0$. *If* $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, *starting from any initial point* $z=(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ *and* $\forall 0\le t\le T$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{h_n}}J_n^2(t) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathcal{S}}{\longrightarrow}} \frac{2}{3}\int_0^t \sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,d\tilde{W}_u\sigma(X_u,Y_u),$$

where $(\tilde{W}_t, t\in[0,T])$ *is a symmetric matrix valued random process independent of the initial Wiener process* $W_\cdot$, *whose entries* $\tilde{W}_\cdot(i,j)$ *are Wiener processes with variance* $V_{i,j}(t)=(1+\delta_{i,j})t$, *these entries being all independent for* $i\ge j$.

PROOF. Define

$$\xi_{n,p}=\frac{1}{h_n^2}\sigma(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n})\left(M(p,h_n)-\frac{2h_n^3}{3}\mathrm{Id}\right)\sigma(X_{(2p-1)h_n},Y_{(2p-1)h_n}),$$

and $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ the σ-field generated by the $\xi_{n,j}$ for $j\le p$. As we already saw

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0[\xi_{n,p}|\mathcal{G}_{n,p-1}]=0$$

(here the null matrix), saying that for a fixed n the $\xi_{n,p}$ are martingale increments and $J_n^2(t)=\sum_p \xi_{n,p}$.

In order to prove the proposition, we can first show that for all $N\in\mathbb{N}$, all N-uple $t_1<\cdots,t_N\le t$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{h_n}}(J_n^2(t),W_{t_1},\ldots,W_{t_N}) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathcal{D}}{\longrightarrow}} \left(\int_0^t \sigma(X_u,Y_u)\,d\tilde{W}_u\sigma(X_u,Y_u),W_{t_1},\ldots,W_{t_N}\right),$$

and then apply the results we recalled on stable convergence as we did in the constant case. To get the previous convergence, one can use the central limit theorem for triangular arrays of Lindeberg type, stated for instance in [10], Theorem 2.8.42.

Another possibility is to directly use Jacod's stable convergence theorem stated in Theorem 2.6 of [26]. Actually in our situation, both theorems require exactly the same controls (this is not surprising), as soon as one verifies that the statement of Jacod's theorem extends to a multi-dimensional setting.

We choose the second solution, and use the notation in [26], Theorem 2.6, so that our $\xi_{n,p}/\sqrt{h_n}$ is equal to their X_{pn}.

Conditions (2.6) (martingale increments) and (2.10) (dependence on $W_\cdot$ only) in [26] are satisfied. Condition (2.8) is also satisfied with $v_s=0$ as we already remarked in the constant case. Here, it amounts to see that

$$\mathbb{E}_z^0[A_{i,j}(n)(W^k_{(2p+1)h_n}-W^k_{(2p-1)h_n})|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}]=0$$

for all triple (i,j,k) where the $A_{i,j}(n)$ are defined in (3.14) and (3.15), which is immediate.

It thus remains to check the two conditions

$$\frac{1}{h_n}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\mathbb{E}_z^0[({}^t e_i\xi_{n,p}e_j)^2|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}]\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathbb{P}_z^0}\int_0^t\theta_{ij}^2(X_u,Y_u)\,du, \tag{3.17}$$

for all $i,j=1,\dots,d$ ($e_l, l=1,\dots,d$ being the canonical basis), and

$$\frac{1}{h_n}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\mathbb{E}_z^0[|\xi_{n,p}|^2\mathbb{1}_{|\xi_{n,p}|>\varepsilon}|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}]\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathbb{P}_z^0}0\qquad\text{for all }\varepsilon>0, \tag{3.18}$$

where $|\xi|$ denotes the Hilbert–Schmidt norm of the matrix $|\xi|$.

We denote by $u_i=\sigma e_i$, and we use the notation of Lemma 3.8, $U_i(n,s)=\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^s(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\,dW_u^i$ and simply $U_i(n)=U_i(n,(2p+1)h_n)$. Hence,

$$A_{i,j}(n)=U_i(n)U_j(n)-\delta_{i,j}\frac{2h_n^3}{3}.$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned}h_n^4\mathbb{E}_z^0[({}^t e_i\xi_{n,p}e_j)^2|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}]&=\mathbb{E}_z^0\Biggl[\Biggl(\sum_{k,l}u_i^kA_{k,l}(n)u_j^l\Biggr)^2\Biggr|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}\Biggr]\\&=\mathbb{E}_z^0\Biggl[\sum_{k,l,k',l'}u_i^ku_j^lu_i^{k'}u_j^{l'}A_{k,l}(n)A_{k',l'}(n)|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}\Biggr]\\&=\sum_{k,l,k',l'}u_i^ku_j^lu_i^{k'}u_j^{l'}\mathbb{E}_z^0[A_{k,l}(n)A_{k',l'}(n)|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}].\end{aligned}$$

But all conditional expectations are vanishing except those for which $(k,l)=(k',l')$, in which case it is equal to

$$(1+\delta_{k,l})\Biggl(\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)^2\,du\Biggr)^2=\frac{4}{9}h_n^6(1+\delta_{k,l}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{h_n}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\mathbb{E}_z^0[({}^t e_i\xi_{n,p}e_j)^2|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}]\\&\quad=\sum_{k,l=1}^d(1+\delta_{k,l})\frac{4h_n}{9}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\sigma_{i,k}^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})\sigma_{j,l}^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}),\end{aligned}$$

and converges to

$$\sum_{k,l=1}^d(1+\delta_{k,l})\frac{4}{9}\int_0^t\sigma_{i,k}^2(Z_u)\sigma_{j,l}^2(Z_u)\,du.$$

We get a similar result for $\frac{1}{h_n}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1}\mathbb{E}_z^0[({}^te_i\xi_{n,p}e_j)({}^te_{i'}\xi_{n,p}e_{j'})|\mathcal{F}_{(2p-1)h_n}]$ for any pairs (i,j), (i',j'). It remains to remark that this increasing process is the one of

$$\frac{2}{3}\int_0^t \sigma(Z_u)\,d\tilde{W}_u\sigma(Z_u),$$

where $\tilde{W}_\cdot$ is as in the statement of the proposition.

Finally, (3.18) is immediately checked, using the previous calculation, Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality. □

To conclude the proof of the main theorem, it is enough to apply Slutsky's theorem since all the error terms converge to 0 in probability (recall that Slutsky's theorem also works with stable convergence (see [26], Proposition 2.5).

4. Infinite-horizon estimation. In the previous section, we dealt with infill estimation. We now consider that we work with an infinite-horizon design. We aim at estimating the quantity $\mathbb{E}_\mu(\sigma^2(X_0,Y_0))$, where $(Z_t := (X_t,Y_t)\in\mathbb{R}^2, t\geq 0)$ is still governed by (1.1) and μ is the invariant measure, supposed to exist. We thus have to introduce some new assumptions:

- $\mathcal{H}_3$ There exists an (unique) invariant probability measure μ and the $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ stationary process $Z_\cdot$ is α-mixing with rate τ, that is (in our Markovian situation), there exists a nonincreasing function τ going to 0 at infinity such that for all $u\leq s$, all random variables F,G bounded by 1 s.t. F (resp., G) is $\mathcal{F}_u$ (resp., $\mathcal{G}_s$) measurable where $\mathcal{F}_u$ (resp., $\mathcal{G}_s$) is the σ-algebra generated by Z_v for $v\leq u$ (resp., $v\geq s$), one has
$$\mathrm{Cov}_\mu(F(Z_u)G(Z_s))\leq\tau(u-s).$$
- $\mathcal{H}_4$ Define $b(x,y) := -(c(x,y)y+\nabla V(x))$. There exists some $r\geq 4$ such that $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^r)<+\infty$ and $\int_0^{+\infty}\tau^{1-(4/r)}(t)\,dt<+\infty$.

These apparently technical assumptions are in a sense "minimal" for applying known results on the central limit theorem for additive functionals of a diffusion process (see, e.g., [6]). We shall come back later to these assumptions, indicating in the last subsection of this section, sufficient conditions for them to hold.

We introduce the following estimator:

$$\mathcal{K}_n = \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{(n-1)h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}\Delta_2X(p,n)\otimes\Delta_2X(p,n), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\Delta_2X(p,n)$ is the double increment of X defined in (3.1).

We now state the main result of this section.

THEOREM 4.1. *Assume that $\mathcal{H}_0$ up to $\mathcal{H}_4$ are satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\int_1^{+\infty} t^{-1/2}\tau^{1/2}(t)\,dt < +\infty.$$

Let h_n be a sequence going to 0 such that $nh_n \to +\infty$ and $nh_n^3 \to 0$.

Then, in the stationary regime,

$$\sqrt{2nh_n}(\mathcal{K}_n - \mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(X_0, Y_0)) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is a symmetric random matrix, with centered Gaussian entries satisfying

$$\mathrm{Cov}(\mathcal{N}_{i,j}, \mathcal{N}_{k,l}) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu(\bar\sigma^2_{i,j}(Z_0)\bar\sigma^2_{k,l}(Z_s) + \bar\sigma^2_{k,l}(Z_0)\bar\sigma^2_{i,j}(Z_s))\,ds,$$

where $\bar\sigma^2(z) = \sigma^2(z) - \mathbb{E}_\mu(\sigma^2(Z_0))$.

REMARK 4.2. In the case where σ is constant, this result is useless as the covariances are all vanishing.

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1. From now on, we assume that the assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$ up to $\mathcal{H}_4$ are satisfied.

Of course since we are looking at the whole time interval up to infinity, it is no more possible to use Girsanov theory to reduce the problem to $c = V = 0$. Hence, arguing as for the statement of (3.5), and defining $b(x,y) := -(c(x,y)y + \nabla V(x))$, we get

$$\Delta_2 X(p,n) = \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)(\sigma(Z_u)\,dW_u + b(Z_u)\,du).$$

We then define the semimartingale $(H_t, (2p-1)h_n \le t \le (2p+1)h_n)$ by

$$dH_t = (h - |t - 2ph_n|)\sigma(Z_t)\,dW_t + (h_n - |t - 2ph_n|)b(Z_t)\,dt,$$
$$H_{(2p-1)h_n} = 0,$$

so that $\Delta_2 X(p,n) = H_{(2p+1)h_n}$. Using Itô's formula, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta_2 X(p,n) \otimes \Delta_2 X(p,n))_{i,j} &= \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)(H_u^i(\sigma(Z_u)\,dW_u)^j + H_u^j(\sigma(Z_u)\,dW_u)^i) \\ &\qquad (4.3)\end{aligned}$$

$$+\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)(H_u^i b^j(Z_u)+H_u^j b^i(Z_u))\,du$$
$$+\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)^2\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_u)\,du.$$

We have a simple but useful estimate, available for all $i=1,\dots,d$, all $k\in\mathbb{N}$, all p and all u between $(2p-1)h_n$ and $(2p+1)h_n$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_\mu(|H_s^i|^{2k})\\ &\quad\le C(k)\|\sigma\|_\infty^{2k}(s-(2p-1)h_n)^k h_n^{2k}\\ &\qquad+(s-(2p-1)h_n)^{2k}h_n^{2k}(\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^{2k})).\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Indeed, one can first use $(a+b)^{2k}\le C(k)(a^{2k}+b^{2k})$, for positive numbers a,b which will be here the absolute values of the martingale part and of the bounded variation part.

Then, if b_u is stationary and h_u bounded by h,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu\left(\left(\int_0^t b_u h_u\,du\right)^m\right)\le t^m h^m\mathbb{E}_\mu(b_0^m),$$

which can be used with $m=2k$, $t=(s-(2p-1)h_n)$, $b_u=b^i(Z_u)$, $h_u=(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)\le 2h_n$. This gives the control for the bounded variation part. Finally, using the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we are reduced to the same control for the martingale part; this time with $m=k$, $h_u=(h_n-|u-2ph_n|)^2\le 4h_n^2$ and $|b_u|\le\|\sigma\|_\infty^2$.

Now we can decompose

$$\mathcal{K}_n-\mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0)=\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1}+\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1}=\frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{(n-1)h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}\Bigg\{&\Delta_2X(p,n)\otimes\Delta_2X(p,n)\\ &-\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|s-2ph_n|)^2\sigma^2(Z_s)\,ds\Bigg\}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}=\frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{(n-1)h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|s-2ph_n|)^2\{\sigma^2(Z_s)-\mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0)\}\,ds.$$

We shall look at both quantities separately, starting with $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}$. □

4.1. *Study of* $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}$.

LEMMA 4.3. *There exists some constant* C *only depending on the bounds of* σ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu\{|\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}|^2\} \le \frac{C}{nh_n}\int_0^{+\infty}\tau(t)\,dt.$$

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{4}{9}\mathbb{E}_\mu\{(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2})_{i,j}^2\}\\
&\quad= \frac{1}{(n-1)^2h_n^6}\sum_{p,q=1}^{n-1}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}\int_{(2q-1)h_n}^{(2q+1)h_n}(h_n-|s-2ph_n|)^2\\
&\qquad\times(h_n-|u-2qh_n|)^2\mathbb{E}_\mu\{\overline{\sigma}_{i,j}^2(Z_s)\overline{\sigma}_{i,j}^2(Z_u)\}\,ds\,du\\
&\quad\le \frac{\|\overline{\sigma}^2\|_\infty^2}{(n-1)^2h_n^6}\sum_{p,q=1}^{n-1}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}\int_{(2q-1)h_n}^{(2q+1)h_n}(h_n-|s-2ph_n|)^2\\
&\qquad\times(h_n-|u-2qh_n|)^2\tau(|s-u|)\,du\,ds\\
&\quad\le \frac{C\|\overline{\sigma}^2\|_\infty^2}{(n-1)}+\frac{C\|\overline{\sigma}^2\|_\infty^2}{(n-1)^2}\sum_{|p-q|\ge2}\tau(2(|p-q|-1)h_n)\\
&\quad\le \frac{C\|\overline{\sigma}^2\|_\infty^2}{(n-1)}+\frac{C\|\overline{\sigma}^2\|_\infty^2}{(n-1)}\sum_{k=1}^{n-2}\tau(2kh_n)\\
&\quad\le C\|\overline{\sigma}^2\|_\infty^2\left(\frac{1}{n-1}+\frac{1}{(n-1)h_n}\int_0^{+\infty}\tau(t)\,dt\right)
\end{aligned}$$

with C some constant. We have used the fact that τ is nonincreasing for the final inequality. □

The previous result indicates why the normalization $\sqrt{nh_n}$ has to be chosen. Now we decompose again

$$\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}=\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,21}+\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,22}$$

by decomposing

$$\sigma^2(Z_s)-\mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0)=\sigma^2(Z_s)-\sigma^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})+\sigma^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})-\mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0).$$

We thus have

$$\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,22}=\frac{1}{2(n-1)h_n}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(\sigma^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})-\mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0))\,ds$$

$$= \frac{1}{2(n-1)h_n}\int_{h_n}^{(2n-1)h_n} (\sigma^2(Z_s) - \mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0))\,ds$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2(n-1)h_n}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (\sigma^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}) - \sigma^2(Z_s))\,ds$$
$$= \overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,222} + \overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,221}.$$

It follows that

$$\sqrt{2(n-1)h_n}\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(n-1)h_n}}\int_{h_n}^{(2n-1)h_n} (\sigma^2(Z_s) - \mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0))\,ds$$
$$+ \sqrt{2(n-1)h_n}(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,221} + \overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,21}),$$

the first summand being the important term the two others being error terms. We shall show that these errors terms converge to 0 in $\mathbb{L}^2$. Indeed,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu((n-1)^2h_n^2(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,221})_{i,j}^2)$$
$$\le C\sum_{p,q=1}^{n-1}\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}\int_{(2q-1)h_n}^{(2q+1)h_n} ds\,du$$
$$\times \mathbb{E}_\mu\{(\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_s) - \sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}))(\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_u) - \sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2q-1)h_n}))\},$$

so that, as for the proof of Lemma 4.3, what has to be done is to control

$$\mathrm{Cov}(\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_s) - \sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}), \sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_u) - \sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2q-1)h_n})).$$

The problem is that, if we use the α-mixing we will not improve upon the bound in the previous lemma, since the uniform bound of these variables is still of order a constant. However, for Markov diffusion processes, one can show (see, e.g., [6], Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 5.1, or [14], Chapter 1, but the latter result also easily follows from the Riesz–Thorin interpolation theorem) the following.

LEMMA 4.4. *Let F and G be as in the definition of the α-mixing except that they are not bounded. Assume that $F \in \mathbb{L}^r(\mathbb{E}_\mu)$ and $G \in \mathbb{L}^a(\mathbb{E}_\mu)$ for some r and a larger than or equal to 2. Then*

$$\mathrm{Cov}_\mu(F,G)$$
$$\le C\min(\tau^{(r-2)/(2r)}(s-u)\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}^r}\|G\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}; \tau^{(a-2)/(2a)}(s-u)\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}\|G\|_{\mathbb{L}^a}),$$

for some constant C depending on a and r only. One also has

$$\mathrm{Cov}_\mu(F,G) \le C\tau^{(r-2)/(2r)}((s-u)/2)\tau^{(a-2)/(2a)}((s-u)/2)\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}^r}\|G\|_{\mathbb{L}^a},$$

for some constant C depending on a and r only.

Choosing $F=\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_s)-\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})$ and $G=\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_u)-\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2q-1)h_n})$, $r=a$, we see that what we have to do is to get a nice upper bound for $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|F|^r)$. But

$$|\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_s)-\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})|\le K|Z_s-Z_{(2p-1)h_n}|,$$

where K only depends on σ and its first derivatives. Using Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we thus have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(|F|^r)\le C(h_n^{r/2}+h_n^r\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^r)).$$

It follows that, provided $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^r)<+\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{Cov}(\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_s)-\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}),\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_u)-\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_{(2q-1)h_n}))\\&\quad\le Ch_n\tau^{1-(2/r)}((|p-q|-1)h_n),\end{aligned}$$

so that finally, as in the proof of Lemma 4.3 we get

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu((n-1)h_n(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,221})_{i,j}^2)\le Ch_n\biggl(1+\int_0^{+\infty}\tau^{1-(2/r)}(t)\,dt\biggr). \tag{4.5}$$

Exactly in the same way, we obtain the same result replacing $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,221}$ by $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,21}$.

It remains to look at

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2(n-1)h_n}}\int_{h_n}^{(2n-1)h_n}(\sigma^2(Z_s)-\mathbb{E}_\mu\sigma^2(Z_0))\,ds.$$

The asymptotic behavior of such additive functionals of stationary Markov processes has been extensively studied. For simplicity, we refer to the recent [6] for an overview and a detailed bibliography. In particular, Section 4 of this reference contains the following result (essentially due to Maxwell and Woodroofe), provided $\int_1^{+\infty}t^{-1/2}\tau^{1/2}(t)\,dt<+\infty$, the previous quantity converges in distribution to a centered Gaussian random variable, as soon as nh_n goes to infinity. The calculation of the covariance matrix of these variables is done as in [6]. We have thus obtained the following.

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Assume that $\mathcal{H}_0$ up to $\mathcal{H}_4$ are satisfied. Assume in addition that $\int_1^{+\infty}t^{-1/2}\tau^{1/2}(t)\,dt<+\infty$. Let h_n be a sequence going to 0 such that $nh_n\to+\infty$.*

Then, in the stationary regime, $\sqrt{2(n-1)h_n}\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}$ converges in distribution to a symmetric random matrix $\mathcal{N}$, with centered Gaussian entries satisfying

$$\operatorname{Cov}(\mathcal{N}_{i,j},\mathcal{N}_{k,l})=\frac{1}{2}\int_0^{+\infty}\mathbb{E}_\mu(\bar\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_0)\bar\sigma_{k,l}^2(Z_s)+\bar\sigma_{k,l}^2(Z_0)\bar\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_s))\,ds.$$

4.2. *Study of* $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1}$.

LEMMA 4.6. *Assume that for some* $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^{4k}) < +\infty$ *and that* $\int_0^{+\infty} \tau^{1-(1/k)}(t)\,dt < +\infty$.

Then there exists some constant $C(k)$ *such that for all* $i, j = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\operatorname{Var}_\mu[(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1})_{i,j}] \le \frac{C(k)}{n}.$$

Hence,

$$\operatorname{Var}_\mu[\sqrt{nh_n}(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1})_{i,j}] \to 0.$$

PROOF. We write

$$\Delta_2 X(p,n) \otimes \Delta_2 X(p,n) - \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |s - 2ph_n|)^2 \sigma^2(Z_s)\,ds = M_{p,n} + V_{p,n},$$

where $M_\cdot$ (resp., $V_\cdot$) denotes the martingale (resp., bounded variation) part. As usual, we use $\bar{V}$ for the centered $V - \mathbb{E}_\mu(V)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{4}{9}(n-1)^2 h_n^6 \operatorname{Var}_\mu[(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1})_{i,j}]\\ &\quad= \sum_{p,q=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu(M_{p,n}^{i,j} M_{q,n}^{i,j} + M_{p,n}^{i,j} \bar{V}_{q,n}^{i,j} + \bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} M_{q,n}^{i,j} + \bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} \bar{V}_{q,n}^{i,j}).\end{aligned}$$

A lot of terms of this sum are vanishing, so that we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4}{9}(n-1)^2 h_n^6 \operatorname{Var}_\mu[(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1})_{i,j}] &= \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu((M_{p,n}^{i,j})^2 + 2\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} M_{p,n}^{i,j} + (\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j})^2)\\ &\quad + \sum_{p>q=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu(\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} M_{q,n}^{i,j} + 2\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} \bar{V}_{q,n}^{i,j}).\end{aligned}$$

Using stationarity and (4.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\mu((M_{p,n}^{i,j})^2) &= \int_0^{2h_n} (h_n - |u - h_n|)^2\\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E}_\mu(\sigma_{i,i}^2(Z_s)(H_s^j)^2 + \sigma_{j,j}^2(Z_s)(H_s^i)^2 + 2\sigma_{i,j}^2(Z_s) H_s^j H_s^i)\,ds\\ &\le C h_n^6 (1 + h_n \mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^2)).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu((V_{p,n}^{i,j})^2) = \mathbb{E}_\mu\left[\left(\int_0^{2h_n} (h_n - |u - h_n|)(H_u^i b^j(Z_u) + H_u^j b^i(Z_u))\,du\right)^2\right]$$

$$\leq Ch_n^3 \int_0^{2h_n} \mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_u)|^2 (H_u^i)^2)\, du$$
$$\leq Ch_n^7 (\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^4))^{1/2} (1 + h_n (\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^4))^{1/2}).$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu((M_{p,n}^{i,j})^2 + 2\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} M_{p,n}^{i,j} + (\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j})^2) \leq C(n-1)h_n^6.$$

Exactly in the same way one obtains that, for $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, provided $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^{2k}) < +\infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(|M_{p,n}^{i,j}|^{2k}) \leq C(k) h_n^{6k}$$

and provided $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^{4k}) < +\infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(|V_{p,n}^{i,j}|^{2k}) \leq C(k) h_n^{7k}.$$

Again we shall use Lemma 4.4 to control

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} M_{q,n}^{i,j}) = \mathrm{Cov}_\mu(V_{p,n}^{i,j}, M_{q,n}^{i,j}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu(\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} \bar{V}_{q,n}^{i,j}) = \mathrm{Cov}_\mu(V_{p,n}^{i,j}, V_{q,n}^{i,j}),$$

and we obtain

$$\mathrm{Cov}_\mu(V_{p,n}^{i,j}, M_{q,n}^{i,j}) \leq Ch_n^6 \tau^{(k-1)/k}((p-q-1)/2)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Cov}_\mu(V_{p,n}^{i,j}, V_{q,n}^{i,j}) \leq Ch_n^6 \tau^{(k-1)/k}((p-q-1)/2)$$

provided, respectively, $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^{2k}) < +\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^{4k}) < +\infty$.

We have thus obtained

$$\sum_{p>q=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu(\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} M_{q,n}^{i,j} + 2\bar{V}_{p,n}^{i,j} \bar{V}_{q,n}^{i,j}) \leq C(n-1)h_n^6 \int_0^{+\infty} \tau^{(k-1)/k}(t)\, dt,$$

so that gathering all previous estimates we get the result. □

It remains to bound the expectation of $(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1})_{i,j}$. But

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[(\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,1})_{i,j}]$$
$$= \frac{3}{2(n-1)h_n^3}$$
$$\times \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu\left[\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)(H_u^i b^j(Z_u) + H_u^j b^i(Z_u))\, du\right]$$
$$= \frac{3}{2(n-1)h_n^3}(A_{n,1} + A_{n,2})$$

with

$$A_{n,1} = \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu \Bigg[\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)(H_u^i b^j(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}) + H_u^j b^i(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}))\, du \Bigg],$$

and

$$A_{n,2} = \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_\mu \Bigg[\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)(H_u^i (b^j(Z_u) - b^j(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})) + H_u^j (b^i(Z_u) - b^i(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})))\, du \Bigg].$$

$A_{n,2}$ can be studied exactly as we did before because $b^j(Z_u) - b^j(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})$ is centered. To be more precise, instead of calculating $A_{n,2}$ we look at the $\mathbb{L}^2$ norm of the random variable

$$\sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)(H_u^i (b^j(Z_u) - b^j(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})) + H_u^j (b^i(Z_u) - b^i(Z_{(2p-1)h_n})))\, du$$

which is, thanks to the centering property, similar to the quantities we have studied in the proof of Lemma 4.6, that is, we can use the mixing property for the *covariances*. It follows that $\sqrt{nh_n}\frac{A_{n,2}}{nh_n^3}$ goes to 0.

Finally, using the semimartingale decomposition of H_u,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n,1} &= \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)\mathbb{E}_\mu(H_u^i b^j(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}) + H_u^j b^i(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}))\, du \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n} \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{u} (h_n - |u - 2ph_n|)(h_n - |v - 2ph_n|) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E}_\mu(b^i(Z_v) b^j(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}) + b^j(Z_v) b^i(Z_{(2p-1)h_n}))\, dv\, du \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$|A_{n,1}| \le C n h_n^4 (\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^2))^2.$$

Hence, $\sqrt{nh_n}\frac{A_{n,1}}{nh_n^3}$ goes to 0, provided $nh_n^3 \to 0$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

4.3. *The σ constant case.* As we already remarked, if $\sigma(x,y)$ is constant, $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{n,2}=0$. The good normalization is then $\sqrt{n}$. Indeed, in the previous proof we did not use the full strength of the bound

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(|V_{p,n}^{i,j}|^{2k}) \le C(k)h_n^{7k},$$

furnishing some $h_n^{7/2}$ instead of a h_n^3 each time a bounded variation term appears. Hence, all terms will go to 0 except the two remaining terms:

- $\sqrt{n}\frac{A_{n,1}}{nh_n^3} \le C(\mathbb{E}_\mu(|b(Z_0)|^2))^2\sqrt{n}h_n$ for which we need $nh_n^2 \to 0$,
- and the remaining martingale term

$$\int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{(2p+1)h_n}(h_n-|u-2ph_n|) \times \int_{(2p-1)h_n}^{u}(h_n-|s-2ph_n|)(\sigma(Z_s)\,dW_s)^i(\sigma(Z_u)\,dW_u)^j$$

in (4.3).

But since σ is constant, this is exactly the martingale term we encountered in Section 3.1. We thus have obtained the following.

THEOREM 4.7. *Assume that $\mathcal{H}_0$ up to $\mathcal{H}_4$ are satisfied and that σ is constant.*

Let h_n be a sequence going to 0 such that $nh_n \to +\infty$ and $nh_n^2 \to 0$.

Then, in the stationary regime,

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathcal{K}_n-\sigma^2) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{D}} \sigma\mathcal{N}_{(d,d)}\sigma, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{(d,d)}$ is as in Lemma 3.1.

4.4. *About $\mathcal{H}_3$ and $\mathcal{H}_4$.* As we promised, we come back to the conditions $\mathcal{H}_3$ and $\mathcal{H}_4$. Actually, in full generality, very few are known. All known results amount to the existence of some Lyapunov function (see, e.g., [30], Theorem 2.4), that is, some nonnegative function ψ satisfying $-L\psi \ge \lambda\psi$ at infinity for some $\lambda>0$. In this case, τ has an exponential decay and the invariant measure exponential moments, so that $\mathcal{H}_3$ and $\mathcal{H}_4$ are satisfied provided b has some polynomial growth. General (and not really tractable) conditions for the existence of ψ are discussed in [30], Sections 3 and 4. One can also relax the Lyapunov control as in [13].

Tractable conditions are only known when σ is constant. They are recalled in [8] (see hypotheses $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ therein, based on [30] and [1]). Mainly, one has to assume that c and V have at most polynomial growth and that $<x,\nabla V(x)>$ is positive enough at infinity, for instance,

$$\langle x,\nabla V(x)\rangle \ge \lambda|x|$$

at infinity.

5. Fluctuation-dissipation relation and Langevin dynamics. In this section, we focus on Langevin equations, satisfying the so-called fluctuation-dissipation relation. The motivation for the study of such dynamics comes from modelling interaction of a subsystem with its environment. Several derivations can be found in the literature, among others the Ehrenfest dynamics (see, e.g., [5, 19, 29]) or the nonlinear Kac–Zwanzig heat bath models (see, e.g., [22]).

We now propose in this section an estimation procedure for Langevin dynamics satisfying the so-called fluctuation-dissipation relation, that is, dynamics described by equation (1.2) in the Introduction. Following Remark 2.4, (1.2) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = Y_t\,dt, \\ dY_t = \sqrt{2\beta^{-1}}s(X_t)\,dW_t - (s(X_t)s^*(X_t)Y_t + \nabla V(X_t))\,dt. \end{cases}$$

The study of such systems is of great interest for understanding molecular dynamics (see references previously cited, as well as [19] and the references therein).

As already mentioned in the Introduction, it is proved under assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ of Section 2, that the solution of (1.2) is exponentially ergodic with invariant probability measure proportional to the Boltzmann distribution $\exp(-\beta H(x,y))$, where $H(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}|y|^2 + V(x)$ and β is inversely proportional to the temperature (see, e.g., [23, 25]). In what follows, we denote by $p_s^\beta(x,y)$ the density of the invariant measure. We shall now propose an estimation procedure for the parameters associated to the system described by (1.2).

First, we consider the estimation of the diffusion term. Under assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$, the results of the Theorem 3.4 still hold ($\mathcal{H}_0$ indeed implies $\mathcal{H}_2$ if the fluctuation-dissipation relation is satisfied). We thus get

$$\mathcal{QV}_{h_n} = \frac{1}{h_n^2}\sum_{p=1}^{[t/(2h_n)]-1} \Delta_2 X(p,n)\otimes\Delta_2 X(p,n) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathbb{P}_z} \frac{2}{3\beta}\int_0^t s(X_s)s^*(X_s)\,ds$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{h_n}}\left(\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(t) - \frac{2}{3\beta}\int_0^t s(X_s)s^*(X_s)\,ds\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{S}} \frac{4}{3\beta}\int_0^t s(X_s)\,d\tilde{W}_s s(X_s).$$

The infinite horizon setting can also be considered. Ergodic properties in [25] and in [23] for nonperiodic potentials imply assumption $\mathcal{H}_3$ with an exponential rate. Moreover, defining $g(x,y) = -(s(x)s^*(x)y + \nabla V(x))$, we get from the form of the invariant density $p_s^\beta(x,y)$: $\mathbb{E}_\mu(|g(Z_0)|^r) < \infty$ for all $r > 0$. Besides, we also have $\int_1^\infty t^{-1/2}\tau^{1/2}(t)\,dt < \infty$. Thus, assumption $\mathcal{H}_4$ is satisfied and the results of Theorem 4.1 still holds:

Let h_n be a sequence going to 0 such that $nh_n \to +\infty$ and $nh_n^3 \to 0$. Then, recalling that

$$\mathcal{K}_n = \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{(n-1)h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}\Delta_2 X(p,n)\otimes\Delta_2 X(p,n),$$

we have

$$\sqrt{2nh_n}\left(\mathcal{K}_n - \frac{2}{\beta}\int s(x)s^*(x)p_s^\beta(x,y)\,dx\,dy\right)\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{N},$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is a symmetric random matrix, with centered Gaussian entries satisfying

$$\mathrm{Cov}(\mathcal{N}_{i,j},\mathcal{N}_{k,l}) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{+\infty}\mathbb{E}_\mu(\bar{s}_{i,j}^2(X_0)\bar{s}_{k,l}^2(X_s)+\bar{s}_{k,l}^2(X_0)\bar{s}_{i,j}^2(X_s))\,ds,$$

where $\bar{s}^2(x) = \frac{2}{\beta}(s(x)s^*(x) - \mathbb{E}_\mu(s(X_0)s^*(X_0)))$. Notice that

$$\frac{2}{\beta}\mathbb{E}_\mu(s(X_0)s^*(X_0)) = \frac{2}{\beta}\int s(x)s^*(x)p_s^\beta(x,y)\,dx\,dy.$$

Although we have been able to estimate the quadratic variation in both cases there are parameters that remain undetermined.

This leads us to consider a more general estimation taking into account our two [7] and [8] previous articles. However, to get easier computations, we shall only consider here the case when the two coordinates of the process are observed. In this case, the computations below are simple adaptations of what we have done in our previous works. The extension to partial observations is not as immediate, and requires to re-write a large part of these works, but following closely the same lines of reasoning. This job cannot be done here.

We know that $p_s^\beta(x,y) = \mathbf{C}(\beta)e^{-\beta(|y|^2+V(x))}$ then $\frac{\nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y)}{p_s^\beta(x,y)} = -\beta\nabla V(x)$. To estimate this last quantity, let K be a convolution kernel with bounded support satisfying $\int K(x,y)\,dx\,dy = 1$ and verifying that there exists an integer $m>0$ such that for all nonconstant polynomial $P(x,y)$ of degree less than or equal to m, $\int P(x,y)K(x,y)\,dx\,dy = 0$. Let h_n, $b_{1,n}$ and $b_{2,n}$ be sequences satisfying the hypothesis (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) of Theorem 3.3 in [8]. Then we introduce the following estimators:

$$\tilde{p}_s(x,y) = \frac{1}{nb_{1,n}^d b_{2n}^d}\sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{x-X_{ih_n}}{b_{1,n}},\frac{y-Y_{ih_n}}{b_{2,n}}\right),$$

$$\nabla_x\tilde{p}_s(x,y) = \frac{1}{nb_{1,n}^{d+1} b_{2n}^d}\sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_x K\left(\frac{x-X_{ih_n}}{b_{1,n}},\frac{y-Y_{ih_n}}{b_{2,n}}\right).$$

The candidate for estimating $-\beta\nabla V(x)$ will be $\frac{\nabla_x \tilde{p}_s(x,y)}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)}$ whose consistence in probability and asymptotic normality is derived below. Let us write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_n(x,y) &:= \left(\frac{\nabla_x \tilde{p}_s(x,y)}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)} + \beta\nabla V(x)\right)\\ &= \left(\frac{\nabla_x \tilde{p}_s(x,y)}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)} - \frac{\nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y)}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)}\right) + \left(\frac{\nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y)}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)} + \beta\nabla V(x)\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)}(\nabla_x \tilde{p}_s(x,y) - \nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y))\\ &\quad - \frac{\nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y)}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)p_s^\beta(x,y)}(\tilde{p}_s(x,y) - p_s^\beta(x,y)).\end{aligned}$$

Following the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [8], we can prove that the second term in the last equality above is $O_{\mathbb{P}_z}(\sqrt{nb_{1,n}^d b_{1,n}^d})$. Recalling that $\mathcal{D}$ denotes the convergence in distributions of probability measures, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{D}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sqrt{nb_{1,n}^{(d+2)}b_{2,n}^d}\,\mathcal{A}_n(x,y)\\ &\quad= \mathcal{D}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sqrt{nb_{1,n}^{(d+2)}b_{2,n}^d}\,\frac{1}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)}(\nabla_x \tilde{p}_s(x,y) - \nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y))\\ &\quad= \frac{1}{p_s^\beta(x,y)}\mathcal{D}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sqrt{nb_{1,n}^{(d+2)}b_{2,n}^d}(\nabla_x \tilde{p}_s(x,y) - \nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y)).\end{aligned}$$

The last equality above is a consequence of Slutsky's theorem.

We now sketch the proof of the convergence in distribution of $\mathcal{R}_n := \sqrt{nb_{1,n}^{(d+2)}b_{2,n}^d}(\nabla_x \tilde{p}_s(x,y) - \nabla_x p_s^\beta(x,y))$. Let us denote by ∂x_l the partial derivative with respect to the lth coordinate. Using as a tool the computation of covariances for sums of α-mixing random variables, we get

$$\operatorname{Cov}(\partial_{x_j}\tilde{p}(x,y), \partial_{x_l}\tilde{p}(x,y)) = O\left(\frac{p_s^\beta(x,y)}{nb_{1,n}^{(d+2)}b_{2,n}^d}\int \partial_{x_j}K(u,v)\partial_{x_l}K(u,v)\,du\,dv\right).$$

Hence, and as a consequence that the kernel K has bounded support we have

$$(nb_{1,n}^{(d+2)}b_{2,n}^d)\operatorname{Cov}(\partial_{x_j}\tilde{p}(x,y), \partial_{x_l}\tilde{p}(x,y)) \to \delta_{jl}p_s^\beta(x,y)\int(\partial_{x_j}K(u,v))^2\,du\,dv,$$

where the δ_{ij}'s stand for the Kronecker symbols. The random sequence $\mathcal{R}_n$ is a sum of a triangular array of α-mixing random vectors of $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is straightforward to extend the results of Theorem 4.3 in [8], via the Cramér–Wald

device, to random vectors. Thus, defining $\mathbf{D}(x,y)=(d_{ij}(x,y))$ as a diagonal matrix, and if the sequences h_n, $b_{1,n}$ and $b_{2,n}$ satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 3.3 in [8], we get

$$\mathcal{R}_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0,\mathbf{D}(x,y)) \qquad \text{where } d_{jj}(x,y)=p_s^\beta(x,y)\int (\partial_{x_j}K(u,v))^2\,du\,dv.$$

We finally obtain

$$\sqrt{nb_{1,n}^{(d+2)}b_{2,n}^d}\mathcal{A}_n(x,y)\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0,\mathbf{L}(x,y))$$

where $\mathbf{L}$ is also diagonal with $l_{jj}(x,y)=\frac{1}{p_s^\beta(x,y)}\int(\partial_{x_j}K(u,v))^2\,du\,dv$.

Now we consider the drift estimation. We can estimate the function $g(x,y)=-[s(x)s^*(x)y+\nabla V(x)]$. We recall that we only consider the case of complete observations and for simplicity we consider now $d=1$. We define the Naradaya–Watson estimator

$$H_n(x,y)=\frac{1}{(n-1)b_{1,n}^d b_{2,n}^d}\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}K\left(\frac{x-X_{ih_n}}{b_{1,n}},\frac{y-Y_{ih}}{b_{2,n}}\right)\frac{Y_{(i+1)h_n}-Y_{ih_n}}{h_n}.$$

The following approximation

$$Y_{(i+1)h_n}-Y_{ih_n}\approx s(X_{ih_n})(W_{(i+1)h_n}-W_{ih_n})+g(X_{ih_n},Y_{ih_n})h_n, \tag{5.1}$$

permits to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(x,y)]\to g(x,y)p_s^\beta(x,y).$$

We recall that we provide here only a flavor of the proof, and not a rigorous justification for each point. We now write

$$\tilde{H}_n(x,y)=\mathcal{I}_{1,n}+\mathcal{I}_{2n},$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_{1n}=\frac{1}{(n-1)b_{1,n}^d b_{2,n}^d}\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}K\left(\frac{x-X_{ih_n}}{b_{1,n}},\frac{y-Y_{ih}}{b_{2,n}}\right)\left(\frac{s(X_{ih_n})(W_{(i+1)h_n}-W_{ih_n})}{h_n}\right),$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_{2n}=\frac{1}{(n-1)b_{1,n}^d b_{2,n}^d}\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}K\left(\frac{x-X_{ih_n}}{b_{1,n}},\frac{y-Y_{ih}}{b_{2,n}}\right)g(X_{ih_n},Y_{ih_n}).$$

We note that

$$((n-1)b_{1,n}^d b_{2,n}^d h_n)\operatorname{Var}(\mathcal{I}_{1n})\to s(x)s^*(x)p_s^\beta(x,y)\int K^2(u,v)\,du\,dv,$$

and, using the α-mixing properties, that

$$((n-1)b_{1,n}^d b_{2,n}^d)\operatorname{Var}(\mathcal{I}_{2n})\to g^2(x,y)p_s^\beta(x,y)\int K^2(u,v)\,du\,dv.$$

These two last results entail

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}((n-1)b_{1,n}^d b_{2,n}^d h_n)\operatorname{Var}(\tilde{H}_n(x,y)) \to s(x)s^2(x)p_s^\beta(x,y)\int K^2(u,v)\,du\,dv.$$

Using approximation (5.1) then allows to derive

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}((n-1)b_{1,n}^d b_{2,n}^d h_n)\operatorname{Var}(H_n(x,y)) \to \sigma^2(x)p_s^\beta(x,y)\int K^2(u,v)\,du\,dv.$$

In this manner, we get

$$\hat{g}_n(x,y) = \frac{H_n(x,y)}{\tilde{p}_s(x,y)} \overset{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{z}}}{\to} g(x,y).$$

This result is also true for $d>1$. Thus, using the relation $g(x,y)+\nabla V(x) = -s(x)s^*(x)y$, we get $\hat{g}_n(x,y)-\hat{g}_n(x,0) \overset{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{z}}}{\to} -s(x)s^*(x)y$, as far as $-\langle \hat{g}_n(x,\mathbf{e}_i)-\hat{g}_n(x,0),\mathbf{e}_j\rangle \overset{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{z}}}{\to} (s(x)s^*(x))_{ij}$.

6. Examples and numerical simulation results. In this section, we want to illustrate some of the main results of the paper. We start with the Itô stochastic differential equation defined by (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = Y_t\,dt, \\ dY_t = \sigma(X_t,Y_t)\,dW_t - (c(X_t,Y_t)Y_t + \nabla V(X_t))\,dt. \end{cases}$$

More precisely, we first consider an harmonic oscillator that is driven by a white noise forcing:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = Y_t\,dt, \\ dY_t = \sigma\,dW_t - (\kappa Y_t + DX_t)\,dt, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

with $\kappa>0$ and $D>0$. For this model, we know that the stationary distribution is Gaussian, with mean zero and an explicit variance matrix given in, for example, [16].

For this example, the diffusion term is constant, equal to σ. Recall that the infill estimator with $T=1$ is defined by (3.2):

$$\hat{\sigma}_n^2 = \frac{1}{[1/(2h_n)]-1}\frac{3}{2h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{[1/(2h_n)]-1}(X_{(2p+1)h_n} - 2X_{2ph_n} + X_{(2p-1)h_n})^2.$$

As the model satisfies assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$, we know from Corollary 3.3 that if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, starting from any initial point $z=(x,y)$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2h_n}}(\hat{\sigma}_n^2-\sigma^2) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathcal{S}}{\longrightarrow}} \mathcal{N}(0,2\sigma^4).$$

A 95% asymptotic confidence interval for σ^2 is thus defined as

$$\mathbf{CI}_{95\%}(\sigma^2) = [\hat{\sigma}_n^2 - 1.96\sqrt{2}\hat{\sigma}_n^2\sqrt{2h_n}, \hat{\sigma}_n^2 + 1.96\sqrt{2}\hat{\sigma}_n^2\sqrt{2h_n}].$$

In the following, we approximate the solution of (6.1) by an explicit Euler scheme. We choose $h_n = n^{-\gamma}$, $\gamma > 0$, $\kappa = 2$ and $D = 2$. Then, for different values of n and γ, we compute $M = 1000$ realizations of $\hat{\sigma}_n^2$. On these M realizations, we compute the empirical relative mean squared error defined by $\mathrm{RMSE} = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M}((\hat{\sigma}_n^{2,j} - \sigma^2)/\sigma^2)^2$, as far as the empirical coverage of the 95% confidence interval defined as $\mathrm{ECOV} = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M}\mathbf{1}_{\sigma^2 \in \mathbf{CI}_{95\%}^j(\sigma^2)}$. The results are summarized in Table 1 below.

As expected, the more γ is high, the more fast is the convergence. The speed of convergence also depends (through a constant term in the asymptotic variance) on the unknown value of σ^2.

We now consider for the same model the infinite-horizon estimation. Model (6.1) satisfies assumptions $\mathcal{H}_0$ up to $\mathcal{H}_4$. Thus, if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, $nh_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} +\infty$ and $nh_n^2 \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, then through Theorem 4.7, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathcal{K}_n - \sigma^2) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathcal{D}}{\longrightarrow}} \mathcal{N}(0, 2\sigma^4),$$

with $\mathcal{K}_n = \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{(n-1)h_n^3}\sum_{p=1}^{n-1}(X_{(2p+1)h_n} - 2X_{2ph_n} + X_{(2p-1)h_n})^2$. A 95% asymptotic confidence interval for σ^2 is thus defined as

$$\mathbf{CI}_{95\%}(\sigma^2) = \left[\mathcal{K}_n - 1.96\frac{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{K}_n}{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{K}_n + 1.96\frac{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{K}_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right].$$

TABLE 1

Infill estimation, empirical relative mean squared error (RMSE) and empirical coverage (ECOV) of the 95% confidence interval with $h_n = n^{-\gamma}$, $M = 1000$ realizations of the estimator, and for different values of n, γ and σ

σ	γ	n	RMSE	ECOV
1	0.5	100	0.47	0.85
1	0.5	1000	0.13	0.92
1	0.5	10^4	0.04	0.93
1	0.7	100	0.19	0.90
1	0.7	1000	0.03	0.94
1	0.7	10^4	0.006	0.95
2	0.5	100	2.03	0.86
2	0.5	1000	0.53	0.91
2	0.5	10^4	0.15	0.94
2	0.7	100	0.72	0.91
2	0.7	1000	0.13	0.94
2	0.7	10^4	0.02	0.95

In the following, we approximate the solution of (6.1) by an explicit Euler scheme. We choose $h_n = n^{-\gamma}$, $\gamma > 0$, $\kappa = 2$ and $D = 2$. Then, for different values of n and γ, we compute $M = 1000$ realizations of $\mathcal{K}_n$. On these M realizations, we compute the empirical relative mean squared error defined by $\mathrm{RMSE} = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M}(\frac{\mathcal{K}_n^j - \sigma^2}{\sigma^2})^2$, as far as the empirical coverage of the 95% confidence interval defined as $\mathrm{ECOV} = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^2 \in \mathbf{CI}_{95\%}^j(\sigma^2)}$. The results are summarized in Table 2 below.

As expected, we observe that the rate of convergence does not depend on γ. The result of Theorem 4.7 has to be compared to the one in Theorem 2 in [28]. In [28], the estimator is obtained by minimizing a contrast. More precisely, the authors in [28] define the contrast to minimize as

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\sigma^2) = \sum_{p=1}^{n-2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{(X_{(p+1)h_n} - 2X_{ph_n} + X_{(p-1)h_n})^2}{h_n^3 \sigma^2} + (n-2)\log(\sigma^2),$$

and they obtain

$$\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{n-2}\sum_{p=1}^{n-2} \frac{(X_{(p+1)h_n} - 2X_{ph_n} + X_{(p-1)h_n})^2}{h_n^3}.$$

They obtain the same rate of convergence but with the asymptotic variance equal to $\frac{9}{4}\sigma^4$. Our definition (3.1) of the double increment of X, which is different from theirs, allows to recover the asymptotic variance $2\sigma^4$ they get for the case of complete observations. In the present paper, we do not study

TABLE 2

Infinite-horizon estimation, empirical relative mean squared error (RMSE) and empirical coverage (ECOV) of the 95% confidence interval with $h_n = n^{-\gamma}$, $M = 1000$ realizations of the estimator, and for different values of n, γ and σ

σ	γ	n	RMSE	ECOV
1	0.5	100	0.022	0.890
1	0.5	500	0.005	0.917
1	0.5	1000	0.002	0.923
1	0.7	100	0.019	0.942
1	0.7	500	0.004	0.947
1	0.7	1000	0.002	0.949
2	0.5	100	0.084	0.892
2	0.5	500	0.017	0.921
2	0.5	1000	0.008	0.933
2	0.7	100	0.085	0.926
2	0.7	500	0.018	0.936
2	0.7	1000	0.008	0.947



FIG. 1. *Estimated (dashed line) and theoretical (solid line) invariant density for the position (left) and for the velocity (right),* $\beta = 2$, $n = 10^5$.

the optimality of the estimators. It is naturally a very interesting problem, which, for the model under study is still open.

We now consider a variant of model (6.1) in which we consider a diffusion term which is nonconstant. It may indeed be interesting in the applications to choose a position-dependent diffusion term, for example, to restrict the action of a thermostat to the boundaries only.

More precisely, we consider the following model:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = Y_t\,dt, \\ dY_t = (2\beta^{-1})^{1/2}\exp\left(\dfrac{-1}{X_t^2+1}\right)dW_t - \left(\exp\left(\dfrac{-2}{X_t^2+1}\right)Y_t + \sin(X_t)\right)dt. \end{cases} \tag{6.2}$$

Model (6.2) is of the form of (1.2). It satisfies the Einstein's fluctuation-dissipation relation discussed in Section 5. The potential is the periodic potential $V(x) = -\cos(x)$ and the diffusion term is mainly active at the boundaries $s^2(x) = \exp(\frac{-2}{x^2+1})$, satisfying however assumption $\mathcal{H}_0$.

The invariant density is known for that model, but it is possible to apply the Kernel estimation procedure proposed in [8] to estimate it. In Figures 1, 2 below, we chose $\beta = 2$, the Epanechnikov kernel, the bandwidths $b_{1,n} = b_{2,n} = n^{-0.2}$, and the discretization step $h_n = n^{-0.30}$ with $n = 10^5$.

We are only considering then the infill estimation. In that case, the infill estimator is defined as

$$\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(1) = \frac{1}{h_n^2}\sum_{p=1}^{[1/(2h_n)]-1}(X_{2p+1)h_n} - 2X_{2ph_n} + X_{(2p-1)h_n})^2.$$

Thus, if $h_n \underset{n\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$, we get from Theorem 3.4

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{h_n}}\left(\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(1) - \frac{2}{3\beta}\int_0^1 \exp\left(\frac{-2}{X_s^2+1}\right)ds\right) \underset{n\to+\infty}{\xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}}} \frac{4}{3\beta}\int_0^1 \exp\left(\frac{-2}{X_s^2+1}\right)d\tilde{W}_s,$$



FIG. 2. *Estimated bivariate invariant density,* $n = 10^6$, $\beta = 2$, $n = 10^5$.

where $(\tilde{W}_t, t \in [0,T])$ is a Wiener process independent of the initial Wiener process $W_.$, with variance equal to 2.

In the following, we choose $h_n = n^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma = 0.7$. We compute $M = 1000$ realizations of the estimator $\mathcal{QV}_{h_n}(1)$ and $M = 1000$ realizations of the limit $\frac{2}{3\beta}\int_0^1 \exp(\frac{-2}{X_s^2+1})\,ds$. This integral is approximated by a quadrature formula with the rectangle rule.

We consider the case $n = 10^5$, $\beta = 2$. We compute the empirical relative mean squared error (RMSE) and we draw (see Figure 3) both the histogram of the estimator and the one of the limit integral for the $M = 1000$ realizations.

We get for both cases RMSE $= 0.0024$.



FIG. 3. *Histograms on* $M = 1000$ *realizations of the estimator (left) and of the limit integral (right),* $n = 10^5$, $\beta = 2$, $h_n = n^{-0.7}$.

The histograms in Figures 3 (left and right) have similarities. However, we note that we have an important boundary effect for the lower tail in both cases, probably due to the approximation of the limit integral by a quadrature rule.

Acknowledgements. We want to heartily acknowledge an anonymous referee for comments on a first version of the paper, especially for suggesting to describe how our techniques can apply to the Langevin dynamics in Section 5.

REFERENCES

[1] Bakry, D., Cattiaux, P. and Guillin, A. (2008). Rate of convergence for ergodic continuous Markov processes: Lyapunov versus Poincaré. *J. Funct. Anal.* **254** 727–759. MR2381160

[2] Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Graversen, S. E., Jacod, J., Podolskij, M. and Shephard, N. (2006). A central limit theorem for realised power and bipower variations of continuous semimartingales. In *From Stochastic Calculus to Mathematical Finance* (Yu. Kabanov, R. Liptser and J. Stoyanov, eds.) 33–68. Springer, Berlin. MR2233534

[3] Bibby, B. M. and Sørensen, M. (1995). Martingale estimation functions for discretely observed diffusion processes. *Bernoulli* **1** 17–39. MR1354454

[4] Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of Probability Measures*, 2nd ed. Wiley, New York. MR1700749

[5] Bornemann, F. A., Nettesheim, P. and Schüte, C. (1996). Quantum-classical molecular dynamics as an approximation to full quantum dynamics. *J. Chem. Phys.* **105** 1074–1083.

[6] Cattiaux, P., Chafaï, D. and Guillin, A. (2012). Central limit theorems for additive functionals of ergodic Markov diffusions processes. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **9** 337–382. MR3069369

[7] Cattiaux, P., León, J. and Prieur, C. (2014). Estimation for stochastic damping Hamiltonian systems under partial observation: II. Drift term. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **11** 359–384. MR3245075

[8] Cattiaux, P., León, J. R. and Prieur, C. (2014). Estimation for stochastic damping Hamiltonian systems under partial observation—I. Invariant density. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **124** 1236–1260. MR3148012

[9] Comte, F., Genon-Catalot, V. and Rozenholc, Y. (2009). Nonparametric adaptive estimation for integrated diffusions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **119** 811–834. MR2499859

[10] Dacunha-Castelle, D. and Duflo, M. (1983). *Probabilités et Statistiques. Tome 2*. Masson, Paris. MR0732786

[11] Dacunha-Castelle, D. and Florens-Zmirou, D. (1986). Estimation of the coefficients of a diffusion from discrete observations. *Stochastics* **19** 263–284. MR0872464

[12] Dohnal, G. (1987). On estimating the diffusion coefficient. *J. Appl. Probab.* **24** 105–114. MR0876173

[13] Douc, R., Fort, G. and Guillin, A. (2009). Subgeometric rates of convergence of f-ergodic strong Markov processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **119** 897–923. MR2499863

[14] Doukhan, P. (1994). *Mixing: Properties and Examples. Lecture Notes in Statistics* **85**. Springer, New York. MR1312160

[15] Florens-Zmirou, D. (1989). Approximate discrete-time schemes for statistics of diffusion processes. *Statistics* **20** 547–557. MR1047222

[16] Gardiner, C. W. (1985). *Handbook of Stochastic Methods: For Physics, Chemistry and the Natural Sciences*, 2nd ed. *Springer Series in Synergetics* **13**. Springer, Berlin. MR0858704

[17] Genon-Catalot, V. and Jacod, J. (1993). On the estimation of the diffusion coefficient for multi-dimensional diffusion processes. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **29** 119–151. MR1204521

[18] Gloter, A. (2006). Parameter estimation for a discretely observed integrated diffusion process. *Scand. J. Statist.* **33** 83–104. MR2255111

[19] Horenko, I. and Schütte, C. (2008). Likelihood-based estimation of multidimensional Langevin models and its application to biomolecular dynamics. *Multiscale Model. Simul.* **7** 731–773. MR2443010

[20] Jacod, J. (2008). Asymptotic properties of realized power variations and related functionals of semimartingales. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **118** 517–559. MR2394762

[21] Jacod, J. and Protter, P. (1998). Asymptotic error distributions for the Euler method for stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Probab.* **26** 267–307. MR1617049

[22] Kupferman, R. and Stuart, A. M. (2004). Fitting SDE models to nonlinear Kac–Zwanzig heat bath models. *Phys. D* **199** 279–316. MR2106316

[23] Lelièvre, T., Rousset, M. and Stoltz, G. (2010). *Free Energy Computations: A Mathematical Perspective*. Imperial College Press, London. MR2681239

[24] Malliavin, P. and Mancino, M. E. (2009). A Fourier transform method for nonparametric estimation of multivariate volatility. *Ann. Statist.* **37** 1983–2010. MR2533477

[25] Mattingly, J. C. and Stuart, A. M. (2002). Geometric ergodicity of some hypoelliptic diffusions for particle motions. *Markov Process. Related Fields* **8** 199–214. MR1924935

[26] Podolskij, M. and Vetter, M. (2010). Understanding limit theorems for semimartingales: A short survey. *Stat. Neerl.* **64** 329–351. MR2683464

[27] Pokern, Y., Stuart, A. M. and Wiberg, P. (2009). Parameter estimation for partially observed hypoelliptic diffusions. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **71** 49–73. MR2655523

[28] Samson, A. and Thieullen, M. (2012). A contrast estimator for completely or partially observed hypoelliptic diffusion. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **122** 2521–2552. MR2926166

[29] Szepessy, A. (2011). Langevin molecular dynamics derived from Ehrenfest dynamics. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **21** 2289–2334. MR2860677

[30] Wu, L. (2001). Large and moderate deviations and exponential convergence for stochastic damping Hamiltonian systems. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **91** 205–238. MR1807683

P. Cattiaux
Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse
Université de Toulouse
Toulouse
France
E-mail: cattiaux@math.univ-toulouse.fr

J. R. León
Escuela de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias
Universidad Central de Venezuela
Caracas
Venezuela
E-mail: jose.leon@ciens.ucv.ve

C. Prieur
Université Grenoble Alpes
and Inria Grenoble Rhône-Alpes
Laboratoire Jean Kuntzmann, Inria/AIRSEA
Grenoble
France
E-mail: clementine.prieur@imag.fr